

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 5, 12 and 13 have been amended, and claim 14 has been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 7 and 9-14 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

A. In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, claims 5, 7, 9, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.; hereafter Kekic) and USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman; hereafter, Bergman). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 5, 12 and 13 have been amended to recite, in part: "combining function blocks in a common branch to form combined functions having respective branches, wherein each end of the respective branches forms an interface appertaining to a block represented by a respective branch, enabling selection of arbitrary interfaces." This feature is supported by lines 19-24 of page 13 of the specification of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Kekic nor Bergman discloses combining function blocks in a common branch to form combined functions having respective branches, wherein each end of the respective branches forms an interface appertaining to a block represented by a respective branch, enabling selection of arbitrary interfaces, as is recited by amended claims 5, 12, and 13. Thus, amended claims 5, 12 and 13 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.) and USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman).

Since claims 7 and 9-11 depend from amended claim 5, claims 7 and 9-11 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.) and USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman) for at least the reasons that amended claim 5 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.) and USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman).

B. In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.; hereafter Kekic) and USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman; hereafter, Bergman) as applied to claims 5 and 7 above, and further in view of USPN 5,604,854 (Glassey; hereafter, Glassey). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Amended claim 5 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.) and USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman) (see above).

Amended claim 5 has been amended to recite, in part: "combining function blocks in a common branch to form combined functions having respective branches, wherein each end of the respective branches forms an interface appertaining to a block represented by a respective branch, enabling selection of arbitrary interfaces." This feature is supported by lines 19-24 of page 13 of the specification of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Glassey does not disclose combining function blocks in a common branch to form combined functions having respective branches, wherein each end of the respective branches forms an interface appertaining to a block represented by a respective branch, enabling selection of arbitrary interfaces, as is recited by amended claim 5. Thus, amended claim 5 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 5,604,854 (Glassey).

Hence, amended claim 5 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.), USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman), and USPN 5,604,854 (Glassey).

Since claims 10 and 11 depend from amended claim 5, claims 10 and 11 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.) and USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman) for at least the reasons that amended claim 5 is submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over USPN 6,664,978 (Kekic et al.) and USPN 5,879,162 (Bergman).

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution

can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

August 26, 2005

By:

Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501